



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

FIFTH SET OF INFORMATION REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY TO CAMBRIDGE ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY AND COMMONWEALTH ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a NSTAR ELECTRIC D.T.E. 03-118/04-114

Pursuant to 220 C.M.R. § 1.06(6)(c), the Department of Telecommunications and Energy ("Department") submits to Cambridge Electric Light Company ("Cambridge") and Commonwealth Electric Company ("Commonwealth") d/b/a NSTAR Electric (collectively, "the Companies") its Fifth Set of Information Requests in the matter docketed as D.T.E. 03-118/04-114.

Requests

- DTE 5-1 Please refer to the parties' proposed Second Settlement Agreement dated February 24, 2006 at paragraph 2.1. State whether the Companies booked transmission and transmission-related revenues to any account other than account 561-140 during the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004. If so, (a) identify the account(s) by number, (b) explain where the information can be found in the Companies' previously provided discovery responses and (c) state whether the account(s) is the subject of the proposed settlement agreement.
- DTE 5-2 Please refer to the Companies' response to DTE-3-2(b) filed on September 14, 2005.
- (a) Define what the Companies mean by "tariff design inconsistencies."
 - (b) For each company, identify and explain in detail all "tariff design inconsistencies" that worked in favor of customers, including but not limited to the dollar figure associated with each inconsistency, during the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004.

- (c) For each company, identify and explain in detail all “tariff design inconsistencies” that worked against customers, including but not limited to the dollar figure associated with each inconsistency, during the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004.
- (d) For each company, explain how the formula rate treatment differed from Boston Edison Company’s Local Service Schedule and the ISO New England Open Access Transmission Tariff for Regional Network Service, including but not limited to how each difference affected customers and the dollar figure associated with each difference during the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004.
- (e) For each company, identify in detail all “tariff design inconsistencies” that were not addressed by the revised tariffs filed with FERC on March 29, 2005 and explain why they were not addressed in those tariffs and whether and how those inconsistencies have been resolved for the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004.

DTE 5-3 Please refer to the Companies’ response to DTE-3-2(c) filed on September 14, 2005.

- (a) Describe the current status of FERC Docket ER05-742-000 and its outcome, if concluded.
- (b) Explain whether and, if so, how FERC Docket ER05-742-000 arose out of the “tariff design inconsistencies” discussed in the Companies’ response to DTE-3-2(b).
- (c) Explain whether and, if so, how the “tariff design inconsistencies” discussed in the Companies’ response to DTE-3-2(b) will be resolved in the context of FERC Docket ER05-742-000.
- (d) If the “tariff design inconsistencies” discussed in the Companies’ response to DTE-3-2(b) are not the subject of FERC Docket ER05-742-000, identify and discuss any FERC proceeding relating to and/or arising out of these “tariff design inconsistencies.”

- DTE 5-4 Please refer to pages 171 through 181 of the attachments to the Companies' response to DTE-3-2(a) filed on September 14, 2005. Provide these same schedules for the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2002 and complete and detailed documentation of the derivation of the schedules for the period of March 1, 1998 through December 31, 2004, including underlying data in Microsoft Excel format with formulas in cells.
- DTE 5-5 What is the carrying cost on the amount to be returned to customers in 2007 pursuant to the Second Settlement Agreement?

Dated: March 9, 2006